## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF HAWAII

		)	
UNITED STATES OF	AMERICA,	)	Case No. 19-CR-00099-DKW-KJM
		)	
	Plaintiff,	)	July 31, 2020
		)	9:35 a.m.
VS.		)	
		)	
KAULANA FREITAS,		)	
		)	U.S. District Court
	Defendant.	)	300 Ala Moana Boulevard
		)	Honolulu, HI 96850
		)	

TRANSCRIPT OF TELEPHONIC DETENTION HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE KENNETH J. MANSFIELD UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

## APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff: Micah W.J. Smith, Esq. Michael David Nammar, Esq. U.S. Attorney's Office 300 Ala Moana Boulevard, #6100 Honolulu, HI 96850 For the Defendant: Donald L. Wilkerson, Esq. P.O. Box 42 Laupahoehoe, HI 96764 Transcription Service: Jessica B. Cahill, CER/CET-708 Maukele Transcribers, LLC 467 Maukele Place Wailuku, Maui, HI Telephone: (808)244-0776

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording; transcript produced by transcription service.

```
1
    JULY 31, 2020
                                                       9:35 A.M.
 2
              THE CLERK: United States District Court for the
    District of Hawaii, with the Honorable Kenneth J. Mansfield,
 3
 4
    United States Magistrate Judge presiding is now in session.
 5
              Criminal number 19-00099DKW, United States of America
    v. Defendant (03) Kaulana Freitas. This case is called for a
 6
 7
    detention hearing. Counsel, please make your appearances for the
    record.
 8
 9
              MR. SMITH: Good morning, Your Honor. Micah Smith and
10
    Michael Nammar for the United States. And also on the line, I
11
    believe, are Pretrial Service Officers Eric Iverson and Diane
12
    Arima-Linscott.
13
              THE COURT: Good morning.
14
              MR. WILKERSON: Good morning, Your Honor. Don
15
    Wilkerson appearing on behalf of Kaulana Freitas. It's my
16
    understanding, Your Honor, that Mr. Freitas is appearing by phone
17
    from the Federal Detention Center in Honolulu.
              THE COURT: All right. Good morning, Mr. Wilkerson.
18
19
              Ms. Munatoa (phonetic), may we have Mr. Freitas,
20
    please.
2.1
              MS. MUNATOA: Yes, Your Honor. I'm handing the phone
22
    to Kaulana Freitas.
23
              THE DEFENDANT: Good morning.
24
              THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Freitas.
25
              THE DEFENDANT: This is Kaulana Freitas.
```

```
1
              THE COURT:
                          Hi. This is Judge Mansfield. Your
    attorney, Mr. Wilkerson is on the phone, as are members of the
 2
 3
    U.S. Attorney's Office, and other members of the public. There
 4
    are a number of hearings this morning.
 5
              We're here for your detention hearing, sir. Do you
    agree to proceed by telephone this morning?
 6
 7
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
 8
              THE COURT: Okay. And, Mr. Wilkerson, before we
 9
    proceed, did you have some time this morning to review this with
10
    Mr. Freitas?
11
              MR. WILKERSON: Yes, Your Honor. I had 15 minutes this
12
    morning to review it with Mr. Freitas, and I was also able to
13
    review it with Mr. Freitas yesterday afternoon.
14
              THE COURT: Okay.
15
              MR. WILKERSON: Yesterday morning, excuse me.
16
              THE COURT:
                          Thank you. Okay. And I have reviewed the
17
    motion by the Government and the memorandum in support of that,
    as well as the thorough report from Pretrial Services. Mr. Smith
18
    or Mr. Nammar, it's the Government's motion, so I'll hear from
19
20
    vou first.
2.1
              MR. SMITH: Thank you, Your Honor. As the Court
22
    indicated, we've submitted a written memorandum. I'm not going
23
    to rehash the arguments we've made there. I did want to say a
24
    couple of things about the Pretrial Services report.
25
    recommends Mr. Freitas' release. With all due respect, we
```

disagree.

But there are two things in particular that I just wanted to flag. One is we are very concerned about Mr. Freitas' father's firearms. And if I'm reading the report, the proposal is — if Mr. Freitas were to be released, the proposal would be for those firearms to be secured with a cousin or something like that. As I read the proposed conditions from Pretrial Services, there doesn't seem to be an identification of who that person is.

It's not obvious to me that there's been any vetting of who that person is. I don't have any confidence just based on the lack of clarity of how this is going to be handled. That the Defendant, Mr. Freitas, wouldn't be able to access those firearms even if they were removed from the vicinity of the home that he would be staying in.

So that continues to be a very significant concern of ours, on top of all the concerns that we've already briefed in our written memorandum.

The second point, Your Honor, is as the Pretrial

Services report itself recognizes, there is evidence suggesting

that a substantial amount of money was transferred from Mr. Miske

to Mr. Freitas. I don't see any explanation for what the purpose

of that money was. And it's, of course, not the case that Mr.

Freitas would have to inculpate himself in any way in this

proceeding, but he does have to provide the Court and Pretrial

with accurate financial information. The financial information

laid out in the Pretrial Services report does not seem to be
consistent with the fact that there is this record of large
financial transactions being sent from Mr. Miske to Mr. Freitas.

And given the nature of this case, given, in particular, the charge against Mr. Freitas, which includes his alleged participation in a chemical weapon attack on a nightclub, at Mr. Miske's direction, I think that gives us some very serious concerns, not just about flight risk, but also about safety.

Finally, Your Honor, I did, of course, want to flag the presumption case because of the drug charge, and I wanted to just clarify one thing. I don't think this is a big issue, but I did notice that in the Pretrial Service report on page 5, there is a description of the Government's representation as being that Mr. Freitas was involved in chemical weapon attacks, plural.

We believe his conduct is very serious, but I just wanted to clarify. Mr. Freitas is charged with a conspiracy in Count 12. Participate in chemical weapon attacks, but, like, he's charged with having actually participated in just one. As I said, we believe that conduct is quite serious, but it was one attack and not two.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Smith. So, yeah, he's -- Mr. Freitas is charged in the conspiracy charges in Counts 12 and 13, but you're telling me both of those relate to just the March 4th, alleged attack?

MR. SMITH: That's basically right, Your Honor. So he

1 -- the logic is he conspired with Mr. Miske and others to engage in chemical weapon attacks, and that's what's charged in the 2 conspiracy count, in Count 12. And then Count 13 charges a 3 4 substantive, which is to say he didn't just agree to carry out 5 chemical weapon attacks, he actually, himself, participated in one of them. But there is some language on page 5, indicating 6 7 that he was a principal figure in the March 4th, chemical weapon attacks on two nightclubs. 8 9 THE COURT: Uh-huh. So I just wanted to clarify that he was a 10 MR. SMITH: 11 principal figure in one of those attacks, against one nightclub. 12 THE COURT: Okay. I appreciate that clarification. 13 Thank you. All right. Mr. Wilkerson. 14 MR. WILKERSON: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you. 15 Wilkerson here. Your Honor, first of all, with regards to the 16 concern about the firearms, of course Mr. Freitas' father would 17 be able to supply the person's name, and address, and location where the weapons would be located. If that is not enough for 18 19 the Court, then Mr. Freitas' father would be able and willing to

put those firearms in any safe location that the Court would feel

2.1

22

23

24

25

comfortable with.

With regards to the financial transactions, Your Honor, and a flight risk, the only information I have with regard to this case, so far, is just the information that's been provided in the bail report and the superseding indictment. Reviewing

- 1 | those two documents, Your Honor, the only financial transactions
- 2 | that are mentioned are on page 5. And I don't see an allegation
- 3 | there that Mr. Freitas actually received any of that money.
- 4 | There's an allegation that checks were written out to his name
- 5 | and deposited somewhere, but there's -- despite, you know, almost
- 6 two years of -- one or two years of investigation, there's no
- 7 | allegation that that money actually went to Mr. Freitas. And
- 8 there's no indication, if it did, that Mr. Freitas had that money
- 9 at this point.
- 10 So anytime we have large transactions like this,
- 11 | there's always that concern, but this did happen a long time ago
- 12 and there's no allegation that Mr. Freitas actually received the
- money.
- 14 Your Honor, I believe the report made by the Pretrial
- 15 | Services Office is complete. It would afford Mr. Freitas the
- opportunity to be free on bail, and I believe it would address
- 17 | all of the Court's concerns. So I would ask the Court to follow
- 18 the recommendation of Pretrial Services, Your Honor.
- 19 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
- I have considered all of the information available to
- 21 | me, including the indictment, the memo, and the proffers from the
- 22 Government, the report and recommendation from Pretrial Services.
- It is a presumption case as noted, which means there's
- 24 | a presumption that there are no conditions or combination of
- 25 | conditions the Court can impose to negate the flight risk or

```
danger to the community posed by the Defendant. And in
responding to that presumption, I think the Defendant argues and
Pretrial Services notes, is a very limited and uneventful
criminal history. He also has strong family and community ties,
```

which weigh in his favor.

I do also, though, have to take into account the nature and the circumstances of the charges alleged, and Mr. Freitas is somewhat uniquely charged in Counts 12 and 13 only with two other Defendants, Mr. Miske and Mr. Stancil, with conspiracy to use a chemical weapon and to, in fact, use that chemical weapon on March 4th, 2017, which is -- and it's very concerning to me.

And then the Government also proffers that a month later, Mr. Miske's car was searched, and I believe HPD seized a firearm, ammunition, and a liquor bottle containing chloropicrin, which is alleged to be the chemical used in these attacks.

And so for those reasons, I find that the Defendant cannot rebut the presumption in favor of detention because I still believe, with all the information available to me, he is a danger to the community, and given the charges alleged he is — all of the charges, including the drug charges, he is a flight risk.

So I will order that he be detained pending trial in this matter. Mr. Smith, if you would please prepare that order.

MR. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Freitas, that concludes

```
your hearing this morning. If you could return the phone to Ms.
 1
 2
    Munatoa.
 3
               THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.
          (Proceedings concluded at 9:47 a.m.)
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

## CERTIFICATE

I, Jessica B. Cahill, court approved transcriber, do hereby certify that pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §753, the foregoing is a complete, true, and correct transcript from the official electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter and that the transcript page format is in conformance with the regulations of the Judicial Conference of the United States.

Dated: December 3, 2021

Jessica B. Cahill, CER/CET-708